

Attorney Docket No. 4906.P148

Patent
10/862,514

clearer understanding of the positions held by the applicant and the examiner, respectively.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 20 2008

Summary of applicant's arguments

Applicant believes that the examiner's rejection of the limitations contained within independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are unclear and would like to clarify the position held by the examiner. Applicant has enclosed a listing of proposed claim amendments which applicant believes the Watanabe reference does not teach or suggest.

With respect to the limitation, "A method in a single network element, the method comprising," the Examiner cites Watanabe's admin center 1 as the single network element. However, with respect to the next limitation, "receiving, at the network element, a packet from a remote client, the packet being addressed to a destination," the examiner cites Watanabe, col. 3, lines 57-59 which does not refer to the admin center 1, but rather, refers to the network gateway device 4 (see Figs. 1 and 8). If the examiner intended to lump the two separate network devices together and call them a single network element, then applicant would respectfully request the examiner indicate so explicitly in the interview because it changes the arguments that the applicant will make. Also, it is respectfully submitted that if the examiner did intend to lump the two network devices (admin center 1 and network gateway device 4) together, then applicant would like to point out to the examiner that Watanabe's figure 1 clearly indicates that there is a network (service providing network 3) located between the two network devices 1 and 4. In this configuration,

Attorney Docket No. 4906.P148

Patent
10/862,514

applicant believes that the two devices cannot properly be considered a single network element because they are separated by a network.

Additionally, with respect to the remainder of the limitations:

examining, based on one or more policies associated with the packet, to determine whether the packet should be redirected to another destination;

forwarding the packet, via a logical interface, to a redirect facility within the network element if the packet should be redirected to another destination; and

forwarding a return packet from the redirect facility to the remote client, the return packet including a redirect address associated with another destination,

there are several points of confusion with respect to the examiner's arguments.

First, the Office Action argues,

examining a set of rules (12 of Figure 8) to determine if the packet will be redirected to another network system's address.

Office Action, p. 2. However, there doesn't seem to be any "redirecting" taught in the Watanabe reference. Watanabe either transmits the packet to its intended destination address or doesn't transmit the packets to its intended destination address. Watanabe never redirects to an address different than the intended destination address. Watanabe either transmits or doesn't transmit to the intended destination address depending on the set of rules contained within the gateway rule processing unit 12 of the admin center 1 and/or the gateway rule storing table 432. There is no teaching that the packets are redirected from an intended destination address to a redirected (or substituted) different destination address. Applicant has

Attorney Docket No. 4906.P148

Patent
10/862,514

attached a set of proposed amendments that specifically recite a "redirecting" limitation.

Second, the Office Action argues,

[i]f the rules indicate a transfer is required then the network device ("Administration Center" of Figure 8) will forward the packet to a transmit-packet processing unit (13 of Figure 8) to perform the redirected forwarding (column 3, lines 60-64; column 10, lines 9-37).

Office Action, pp. 2-3. However, this is confusing because the "transmit-packet processing unit" is unit 41 of Watanabe's figure 8, and the "rule transfer unit" is unit 13 of Watanabe's figure 8. Applicant respectfully requests clarification as to which of the two units the examiner is referring to in the rejection. By the way, the rule processing unit 13 only transmits the gateway rules to the transmit-packet transfer unit 41 and does not have anything to do with transmitting the packets themselves (see e.g., Watanabe, col. 4, lines 7-9). Additionally, Watanabe's col. 10, lines 9-31 indicates that the transmitting of the packets is performed by the transmit-packet transfer processing unit 41 of the network gateway device 4, and not the rule transfer unit 13.

Finally, the Office Action argues,

[t]he newly forwarded packet will receive a new destination address (Figure 9; column 9, lines 59-65).

Office Action, p. 3 (emphasis added). However, there is no indication in Watanabe's figure 9 or column 9, lines 59-65 that indicates a new destination address. If the examiner continues to hold this position, it is respectfully requested that the examiner clearly indicate where the old destination address is replaced with a new destination

Attorney Docket No. 4906.P148

Patent
10/862,514

address in Watanabe. Clarification is respectfully requested. Additionally, applicant refers the examiner to the proposed claim amendments which specifically recite replacing an intended destination address with a redirected address.